	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/493,984	EISENBART ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael J Simitoski	2134
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Michael J Simitoski	(3)	
(2) <u>Thomas Franklin</u> .	à ⁽⁴⁾	
Date of Interview: 25 November 2003	Time: <u>10:00 a.m.</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		•
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	he examiner will provide a writh record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
	•	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The purpose of this phone interview was to clarify that pre-amendment B (Oct. 31, 2003) had been submitted after a first office action (Oct. 28, 2003). Mr. Franklin was aware that pre-amendment B set forth identical claims as set forth by pre-amendment A. According to Mr. Franklin, the second pre-amendment was submitted to remove any confusion, if any confusion existed, as a result of pre-amendment A suggesting a previous amendment had been submitted, which it had not. As no changes have been made to the examined claims, with respect to the office action, Mr. Franklin will respond to the original office action.